

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-5 and 7 are currently amended. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification and drawings. Accordingly, no new matter has been added by way of these amendments. Support for applying heat treatment to a fully or partially cured mixture (e.g., after the mixture has substantially cured) can be found at paragraph [0006] of the published application and elsewhere.

Telephonic Examiner Interview on June 24, 2008

The undersigned attorney would like to thank the examiner for the courtesy of the telephonic interview of June 24, 2008. The interview included a discussion of which steps are necessary to carry out the method of claim 1. Upon review, the examiner indicated that steps (c), (e) and (g) through (i) as recited in the Office Action mailed April 4, 2008, were not essential to the method of claim 1. No agreement was reached on the precise wording and sequence of any of the other method steps; rather, the examiner indicated that he would further consider any arguments and amendments when submitted in writing.

Outstanding Action Mailed April 8, 2008

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as not being enabled by the disclosure because they allegedly omit steps that are essential to practice the claimed invention, and 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps. Applicants respectfully disagree. As discussed in the June 24th examiner interview, the invention

of claim 1 can be practiced using only those steps recited, a fact that one skilled in the art would readily recognize. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus solicited. Claims 2-7, being dependent upon claim 1, are patentable for at least this reason.

The examiner cites the Wycech (U.S. Patent No. 4,923,902) and Mori (JP 01-249841) references as disclosing similar methods. However, neither reference teaches or suggests applying heat treatment to a curable mixture after that mixture has substantially cured, as required by claim 1. In fact, both references teach quite the opposite which is why the microsphere expansions in those references do not provide the permanent deformation and compressive residual stress realized when performing the method of claim 1.


It is believed that this submission addresses all outstanding rejections. Allowance of the application is thus solicited.

Request for Interview

In the event that the Examiner finds any reason that the application cannot be allowed in its present form, the Applicant wishes to conduct an interview with the Examiner prior to any next Office Action in order to provide an opportunity for coming to agreement upon allowable claims. To arrange the interview, the Examiner should call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number given.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Timothy B. Paul, Reg. No. 51,203
Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty, McNett & Henry LLP
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137
(317) 634-3456